THE

HARVARD LYCEUM.

No. 4.] *Cambridge, August* 25, 1810. [Vol. I.

ON THE PROBABILITY OF A RETURN OF THE DARK AGES.

(Continued from page 66.)

THE revival of letters was gradual, and produced by intelligible causes. After a struggle of centuries between barbarism and refinement, superstition and philosophy, we again see the empire of letters established. Man is no longer a slave to folly and vice. He has become a reasoning, self-directed being; too enlightened to be the obsequious tool of wicked priestcraft, he has shaken off the fetters of superstition, and clothed himself in the armour of independence. Though a great part of the world is yet in darkness, we have the satisfaction of seeing numerous nations enlightened by science, and polished by arts. Roused by the barefaced impositions of priests, they have revolted from that mental bondage, and forced those nefarious instruments of papal tyranny, to seek a retreat in the solitude of the cloister.

It is the favourite hypothesis of some, that learning has arrived at its acme; that it has, like the ocean, its regular ebbs and flows; that at one time man will be exalted to the highest pitch of mental refinement, and thence precipitated to the lowest point of degradation. This supposition is conceived to correspond best with the general course of nature.

Animals and plants are limited in magnitude and time of existence; they have not a constant increase; and these are erroneously taken as completely analogous to the human mind. Every thing except the mind, which is susceptible of infinite improvement, may, perhaps, be considered, as having boundaries, which are impassable.

The changes in the character of nations do not arise from causes, which lie beyond the reach of the human understanding. Because the world was once enlightened and afterwards relapsed into ignorance, we cannot determine this to be the necessary result. To say this, would be to say, that different ages possessed different degrees of genius; that after a course of years when men are blessed with minds capable of receiving instruction, then the leaden age must return, and literature again necessarily lie neglected. But if we allow these changes in the literary character of a country to arise from her political situation, then this notion of regular and unavoidable ebbs and flows is done away; the arts and sciences may flourish while any remain to cultivate them. No need, then, of waiting the propitious moment; great geniuses will appear, whenever sufficient excitements are exhibited to call forth their exertions. This can be proved by resorting to history. To every reader of the Roman history it must be evident, that the decline and final extinction of the Roman empire and Roman literature must be attributed to the same causes. In Greece and Rome, superstition, war, and tyranny, were the destroyers of learning. When those countries were subdued by tyrants, genius had no excitements, it was overawed and kept in subjection, as the mortal enemy of despotism and the firm friend of liberty. When they had been exhausted by the luxury and profusion of their rulers; when they had been depopulated by the cruelty of tyrants, and disheartened by oppression; when tribute could no longer buy off those enemies, which they

wanted courage to repel; then hosts of barbarians, allured by the mildness of the climate, or a hope of plunder and love of war, poured down upon all sides, and overwhelmed them like a torrent. The rude hand of the hardy warriors, already taught to despise the conquered, spared not the monuments of literature nor the venerable retreats of philosophy. The nations thus ravaged, the learned and unlearned rooted out, were kept from rising from this state of degradation by superstition, which was fast spreading over the earth, from the unnatural mixture of heathen mythology and true religion. These are the evident causes of the extinction of ancient learning. Let it then be our concern to grow wise from the experience of past ages. The same causes will, in like circumstances, produce similar effects. Let us examine what shall secure the vast literary fabrick of the present day from the like dilapidation.

Among the instruments of the restoration of learning, the art of printing may be considered the most efficient. The invention of this art happened seasonably to aid the dissemination of the true, reformed principles of the Christian religion; and with them excited a general spirit of inquiry and independence. After the first propagation of the Christian doctrines, the world had fallen into a state far more despicable and wretched, than that of heathen nations. The doctrine of papal infallibility, the impositions of the priests, the sale of indulgences, the practice of seclusion in monasteries, and the ostentatious exhibitions of outward piety, all which were consequences of the Catholick religion, afford far more remarkable instances of folly and superstition, of hypocrisy and corrupt morals, of depravity of heart and unbounded credulity and fanaticism, than any thing to be found in the religion of the heathen world. The tendency to degrade human nature and render it mean, and miserable, which can be discovered in the worship of the

Grecian and Roman deities, in their ceremonies and sacrifices, or even in their sacred mysteries, however corrupt they finally became, is not to be compared with that of the abuses originating from the papal see. But, roused from their lethargy, mankind revolted from the dominion of such folly and wickedness. The concurrence of many favourable circumstances was necessary to overthrow a power of so vast pretensions, as that of the popes; and probably without the art of printing, all attempts would have proved abortive. By the help of this, true principles were diffused, impostures exposed, and society rendered more enlightened, notwithstanding the vigilance of papal emissaries. The reformers were thus furnished with the means of spreading their principles by vehicles, able to elude the grasp of their opponents. Copies of their works were multiplied at pleasure, nor could the threats of tyrants nor the anathemas of the pope prevent their diffusion.

Since the use of the press, the manners, and opinions of mankind have undergone incredible changes. Instead of seeing but few men who can even read or write, and still fewer who have any considerable knowledge of ancient Greece and Rome; we now see whole nations, from the king to the peasant, professing considerable skill in the lower departments of learning, and a large number, men of extensive information. Instead of a nation receiving their religion from poets, or from ancient fame; we now see men examine before they believe, and require to be convinced, before they assent; instead of an ignorant, servile populace, ready to be misled by every upstart demagogue, obtaining their knowledge of state affairs wholly from report, deciding without deliberation, and unaccustomed to act from their own knowledge; we now see a respectable yeomanry, conscious of their own political importance, not wavering, and listening to ambitious orators to know their duty, but firm

and steadfast, because possessed of correct information. This, then, is the difference between the ancient and the modern world, and for this we are indebted to the art of printing; and to the art of printing we shall be indebted for the preservation of these advantages. Not but that the ravages of war, or other political events, may for a while sink a part of the world in darkness; but the principles of liberty are so widely disseminated and so thoroughly understood since the revival of letters, that the successes of a warriour can never be extensive, nor can other political events long smother the spirit of an enlightened nation. The republick of letters, formerly, was not so extensive, well founded, and well regulated, as to insure its continuance; but now its own bulk will be its support; and considering its many resources we have little reason to fear its future extinction.

No one will say, that the arts and sciences have received no additions since the revival of letters. Every branch of learning has been advanced in the modern world, beyond its limits in Greece and Rome. The improvements in the mathematicks, in astronomy, and the various other branches of science, sufficiently prove, that the ancients had not proceeded to the extent of man's capacity. Now it is absurd to suppose the human powers different in the old world from what they now are—to suppose, that the descendants of the Goths and Vandals, after their forefathers had slept for centuries, should be blessed with minds better able to make advances in learning than the sons of the old Phœnician, Pelasgick, Trojan, and Latin colonists. Therefore the cause of the retrograde motion of the human race from learning to barbarism is not to be ascribed to their incapacity to advance farther; but it must be sought in the political events of that period. Fortunately, the peculiar circumstances in the political world, which paved the way for man's relapse into ignorance, were such, as are not likely to

recur. The world was ruled by one city, which was the centre and support of civilization and refinement. When Rome fell, the other nations flew off, like the parts of an exploded planet, and settled in their former uncivilized state. The discovery of the western continent frees us from all fears of the recurrence of similar events.

Calm then all apprehensions for the future fate of the human race. The mind of man admits still further improvement—the art of printing will aid in communicating and defending his stores of knowledge—and the world is not soon to submit to one man. These three considerations shall be our consolation, and if true, we have no reason to be alarmed for posterity. Though the eastern world should be forced to submit to the monster of Corsica—though Paris should concentrate in herself all the learning and all the excellence of that part of the globe ; we confidently trust, that the day is far distant, when a Napoleon shall arise, who will be able to extend his victorious arm across the Atlantick, and sway both hemispheres with his resistless sceptre.

FORENSICK DISPUTATION.

Whether the language of a country be more perfect for being in part derived from other languages?

THE AFFIRMATIVE.

IT may facilitate the discussion of this question to describe, as briefly and accurately as may be, that ideal perfection of language, to which the nearer any language approaches in reality, the more perfect it is. In a word, then, a most perfect language would be a language in which one might unite strength, sublimity, beauty, harmony, ease, precision and perspicuity. That this is a complete enumera-

tion of the qualities which contribute to the perfection of language, I do not aver; but I think my opponent will concede that the degree of perfection in any language is in proportion to the number and degree of the above-mentioned qualities which it possesses.

I am well aware that my opponent may pursue a different plan of inquiry from that which appears to me conclusive, in the present case. It may be triumphantly asked, which is the most perfect language ever spoken in the world? It must be answered, the GREEK. He may assert, (for it has been asserted upon high authority,) that the Greek language was not derived, even in part, from any other language; and hence infer that those, which are thus derived, cannot be made the most perfect. In the first place I doubt whether the assertion be correct. I know what the Grecian standard of purity was. I know that no foreign or barbarous word, as it was called, was admitted among their indigenous words, on any conditions whatever. But this standard of purity was erected after the language was formed, not while it was forming. For, unless our common and most approved lexicographers have mistaken, several Greek words are derived from the Hebrew. For example, (to instance in the first two, which occur upon opening Schrevelius,) Ἄγχω is derived from חנק, and Ἄγω from נהג. But supposing that this is not proof positive, or that the instances, which can be brought are too few to prove a general rule, I would ask, is it likely that the heterogeneous tribes, which composed this unparalleled nation, when they came together, brought precisely the same words into the common stock? Did the Phœnicians, the Syrians, the Pelasgi, the native barbarous Greek, &c. speak the same dialect? Or is it more probable that the Greek language, like the people who spoke it, was a mixture of all these? And because, on account of its antiquity, of the

remote period at which it attained comparative perfection and proclaimed a non-intercourse with foreign languages, and the many combinations, and the variations of dialect, which hide their primitive words, we cannot trace them to their several sources, does it follow that they were all indigenous? But without insisting farther on this point, it by no means follows, that there never *can* be a language more perfect than the Greek, because there never *has* been.

I have been at considerable pains to prove, what few perhaps will call in question, that a favourite and very popular language might not be unduly wrested to the disadvantage of my cause; and, I conclude from the indecision in which this mode of inquiry must leave us, that we can arrive at no unanswerable inference in this case, but by considering how the greatest number and highest degree of the above-mentioned qualities, which contribute to the perfection of language, may be combined; and the way in which such combination can be soonest made, I think we may fairly conclude to be the best way of perfecting a language. And this I conceive to be the grateful reception of aid from every language, which has a beauty to recommend it; even if it have faults likewise, since they will serve to disgust men of taste, and guard them from copying the imperfections of others, or indulging their own. The reasons for this opinion I will briefly state.

1. What would be the character of a language, in no part derived from any other? The genius of such a language would correspond to that of the people who should speak it. Being a thing entirely of their own formation, it would partake of all their characteristical defects in a most eminent degree. It would of course be national and particular, and not a proper medium for the communication of thought among mankind. It would neither suit the general and abstract speculations of the philosopher, nor the convenience, or

hardly the necessities of the vulgar, and although being systematical and analogical, it might present a simple and beautiful structure to the eye, it would serve very few purposes of utility.

2. All is directly the reverse in a language in part derived from others. Its native asperities are pruned away, while its beauties are preserved and improved. The language forms the character of the people, and not the people the character of the language; and both partaking of the excellencies of neighbouring nations, and avoiding as much as possible their defects, are consequently of a superiour kind. Though by the introduction of foreign words a language may lose somewhat of its harmony for want of regular terminations and variations, and somewhat of its strength as well as its harmony, by having its liberty of being transposed restricted; yet its copiousness and accuracy would more than compensate the loss of some few analogical beauties. It would be an edifice somewhat irregular, but serving all the various purposes of convenience and use.

3. It is some confirmation of this theory that the English, next to the Greek, is probably the most perfect language in the world; and that its principal defects are the remaining asperities of its primitive words, which are not yet sufficiently softened by intermixture with foreign words. Contrast it with the Hebrew, and its excellence will be more apparent. Whatever the Hebrew language may boast (and it may at least boast of being as little indebted to other languages, as any language extant,) it is manifestly rough, barren, and elliptical, and so stately and uniform, that one cannot read a line of it, without thinking of a pharisaical high priest, slowly measuring the pavements in his pontificals.

If all this does not convince, I would advise my opponent, first to spend some eight or ten years among the inhabitants of

the Pelew Islands, or in the Northern Archipelago, where languages have been improving, without being corrupted by the introduction of outlandish words and phrases, probably for some thousands of years.

2. I would advise him upon his return, if still unconvinced, to reject all the technical terms now in use in our language, which have been borrowed from other languages, and invent a new vocabulary of words, purely Saxon, or of Saxon derivation.

3. The third and last thing which I should advise him to do, if he still continue obstinate, is to write a *philosophical grammar*, which will serve for the basis of an *universal language*, (a great desideratum with some philosophers), but without having recourse to the grammar of any language but of that, which he should consider the most perfect, whether his own or Pelewese. Exercises like these would be most likely to dispel his obstinacy, and save him from the fate of the wayward opposers of truth.

THE NEGATIVE.

THE adoption of words from one language into another is a source of great inconvenience, on account of the difficulty of attaching to words hitherto unknown in one language, the precise signification which they retain in their primitive language. It is impossible for us so exactly to compare our idea of any thing with the idea which a foreign word expresses, as always to pronounce them the same. We know not how much the use of that word may have been perverted by custom, by accident, or design. And though the person who first adopts a word from another language may himself with sufficient accuracy comprehend it, on account of a long attention to the nature of that language, and an intimate knowledge of it, yet in the course of its circulation, it must be used by many persons, who will be unacquainted

with its original, and consequently be liable to corrupt its use.

Words can be borrowed from one language into another, for three purposes only; first, to express some new idea belonging to the nation which borrows the word; second, to express some old idea belonging to the nation that borrows the word in a new way; third, to express some idea of the nation from which the word, as well as the idea it signifies, is borrowed. It will be my aim to prove that in neither of these cases is a language advanced towards perfection by borrowing words from another. In the first place, when a word is borrowed from another language to express a new idea, a word is taken from a tongue of a particular construction, syntax, &c. and engrafted upon another, which inevitably differs from it in many of these respects. And where is the advantage of stripping a poor word in the Hebrew language of all its forms, constructions, significations, and relations, to carry it into America, to make an addition to the Mohawk vocabulary? Why is it not as well for the Mohawk to originate at once an articulation of his own to express his own idea, as to travel to Palestine for it? Secondly, where an old idea is to be expressed by a word derived from another language, the injury resulting is still more apparent. After an idea has for a long time been expressed by a certain articulate sign, if another is used to express it, derived from a foreign tongue, the inconveniences and inutility of the change are the same as those in the other case, with the additional injury which follows from heaping up the pile of obsolete words, and producing a fluctuation in the state of language. If the word be borrowed for any considerations, as euphony or etymology, more popular than the former, the old one is of course placed on the list of obsoletes, and every body must resort to their dictionaries, before they can express their most intimate ideas. In the third case, when

ideas and words are both borrowed, an injury results to the borrowed language, which would be avoided, by taking only the ideas. From this cause follow all those anomalies and irregularities, which distract the etymology and confute the syntax of all known tongues. There is no doubt that, when a communication exists between two countries, it will be very necessary to interchange a number of ideas, for the purpose of facilitating every kind of intercourse. But this is only to generate new ideas in the recipient language; so that all the observations upon the first of the three suppositions apply to this last. Thus have I attempted to show that a language is in no case improved by being distracted, confused, and intermingled, with a strange jargon of heterogeneous names.

But it may be necessary to present a few arguments in a less abstract form. The inconvenience of borrowing words from one language into another, will be more palpable, when considered with reference to the arts and sciences. Let us suppose that a new society had progressed but a very little way in forming a language, and but very little way in the cultivation of the arts and sciences. If during their progress in learning, they determine to seek words for their new combinations and their newly discovered substances among foreign languages, where science and art have been carried to a high pitch of improvement, it is very obvious that many words after their adoption cannot be properly applied to the new ideas and combinations of the young society. It is evidently far better to invent words of their own; and that this invention keep pace with the arts and sciences. Owing to a deficiency of language in this respect, how much preparatory knowledge are the youth of the present day obliged to acquire, before they can enter upon a progress in any of the sciences. The science of physick, for instance, is crowded with Latin names, on account of which the young doctor must become

a pedant, before he can be made a practitioner. Law is a labyrinth in more senses than one; and the complication of Latin, foreign, uncouth terms renders it so in an eminent sense of the word. No body can study botany, which ought surely to be familiarized to us as much as possible, without the perplexity of thousands of Latin appellations. Now every one will acknowledge, that if in these sciences, we could use none but pure English words, we should be accustomed to hear many of them from our infancy, which would facilitate our progress in knowledge to a great degree. Let us recollect too that many words, which scientifick men endeavour to preserve in their original Latinity, do in course of time become neglected, and English words are substituted in their stead; which circumstance evinces the repugnance society has to the adoption and circulation of foreign words.

It is a very general, and a very correct observation, that whoever would wish to arrive at a very accurate and critical knowledge of our own language, so as to read all our authours with pleasure and profit, must study the Greek and Latin tongues. Now what a slavish ordeal is this to pass through, in order to know what we have a right to know without so much trumpery labour. How would the ancient Israelitish youth, who received their educations in the schools of the prophets, have murmured, if to arrive at a thorough knowledge of their native Hebrew, they had been obliged to pour over Amalekitish, Hittitish, Amoritish, and Perrizzitish lexicons and grammars! But no! they had not such an infinity of drudgery to undergo; and to this fortunate circumstance we must ascribe the purity and perfection of the Hebrew language. There is no doubt that Solomon had been endeavouring to learn some foreign tongue, when he exclaimed, amongst some of his "dark "sayings," that "much study is a weariness of the flesh."

We would appeal to fact; examine the most obvious languages, and then decide which can claim the greatest advancement towards perfection. The Italian, the French, and the Spanish are all derived in a great measure from the Latin. Hear what an excellent philologist acknowledges of them, " they may be compared to those rivers whose waters " are always swelling, and always muddy and turbulent; " that never keep long within their channel, but are ever " overflowing, ever noisy and precipitate." But we cannot say so of the Greek, nor the Hebrew. It is the peculiar characteristick of those languages, to be ever

" .....calm, yet clear; and gentle, yet not dull;
" Strong without rage, without o'erflowing, full;"

and this we can pronounce truly of all those languages, which have never been so slavish as to depend on their predecessors for their materials.

In our country, the evils of words being derived from other languages, are not trifling. Innovations in the introduction of new words often subject us to the censure of of the purer English writers. My opponent may congratulate himself on an accession to the language of abundant provincial barbarisms, to perfect and beautify it; and may rejoice at the emigration of so many Irishmen, and Dutchmen, and Germans, who may supply whatever is deficient in our language by the copiousness of their own, and correct whatever is harsh in its tones by the melody of theirs.

POETRY.

THE AD,

A POEM IN TEN BOOKS. BY J. LOWBARD.

THE following communication will explain itself to the publick; and the use, which we intend to make of the information it contains, will appear from our remarks that follow it.

To the editors of the Harvard Lyceum.

GENTLEMEN,

THIS poem is your property. I present it to you in manuscript, that you may bring it before the world in the manner you think proper. This letter will explain to them my motives for offering you such a testimony of my regard; a regard which certainly comprizes all the good opinions, that the merit of talents of any set of editors can inspire in the breast of the authour.

Though as faithful guardians you would foster an orphan of mine, yet as adoptive fathers your power over it would seem more complete. These are motives of affection and precaution, but I am likewise impelled by a motive of justice. My poem being written for your paper, and benefitted by the models which your effusions present, as well as by those of my excellent wife,* is to come forward, I hope, ornamented by your taste. You will please to design the subjects to be engraved, and as I am unwilling to support the charge of such expensive and elegant decorations as the poem merits, you will please to favour their execution by your own superintendance, and to permit them to be made at your own expense. So that the whole work as belonging to the publishers, and estimated by its cost, is yours already. My proportion has cost me nothing but leisurely and exhiliarating labour (excepting to be sure the price of pen, ink, and paper,) in which I always delight. Take it then to yourselves, and let it live, as I trust it will forever, a monument

* I shall notice her emendations by an italick character.

of my regard. A monument of your fame you cannot need. Your universal merits will render it proper that the panegyrical lines which you will please to select and write under my portrait, should be transferred to your own society picture. Posterity will vindicate the right and fix them in their place.

Continue to be celebrated, gentlemen, as your various merits entitle you to be. Continue to enhance that merit by well written essays for the amusement of your subscribers. And as this address will coexist with the poem, to which it is prefixed, you need resort to no other method to unite your memory to mine forever.

J. LOWBARD.

WE are very grateful to Mr. Lowbard for his invaluable kindness and undeserved compliments, as bestowed and expressed in his very welcome letter. We have set up two nights and been absent from three lectures in deliberating upon the course of conduct which we ought to pursue with regard to this donation. Upon a calculation of the limits of our paper, and the size of the poem, we cannot reconcile it to our consciences to insert it *in extenso*, neither as reapers in the harvest of literature, can we persuade ourselves that we should not be culpably delinquent did we neglect to publish some of its most valuable parts. We shall therefore insert the Arguments of the respective books, enlarge upon the thread of the story as contained in them, and select the most impressive passages. We would particularly observe too that the hope of Mr. Lowbard shall not be disappointed; that if he will send us a miniature of himself we will procure a suitable engraving of it, and that it shall be our study to select and design the best subjects for the prints. Once more expressing our gratitude to the authour for his unsolicited goodness, in investing us with the property of the poem, we proceed to its publication and commence with his

PREFACE.

IN preparing this work for publication, it seems proper to offer some observations explanatory of its design. The AD is a general poem, the subject is universal. But most of the events are so disconnected in their relations, so heterogeneous in their nature, and so distant in their date, as to be incomprehensible in epick limits. As therefore I do not pretend to have followed the received rules of the epopea, I shall not attempt to prove by any latitude of reasoning that I have written an epick poem.

The subject indeed is vast, is superiour to any of those on which the celebrated poems of this description have been constructed, and I have no doubt but the form I have given to the work is the best that the subject would admit. It may be added that in no poem are the beauties of time, place, and action more rigidly observed. For the action is merely employed about men who live on this speck of earth, and the bounds of whose life are a day.

But these circumstances of classical regularity are of little consequence in estimating the real merit of a work of this nature. Its merit must depend on the importance of the action, the disposition of the parts, the invention and application of the incidents, the propriety of the illustrations, the liveliness and chastity of the images, the suitable intervention of machinery, the moral tendency of the manners, and the strength and sublimity of the sentiments, the whole being clothed in language whose energy, harmony, and elegance shall constitute a style every where suited to the matter they have to treat.

In all these particulars I am conscious of perfect success. It will occur to my readers with respect to the character of the style, that the instruments and terms of the mechanical arts are not yet rendered familiar in poetical composition.

I have rejected the common prejudice, and have enriched my stock of epithets and names, by copious abstractions from the terms of the useful arts and the vocabulary of common life. I should enlarge on all those circumstances which are above enumerated, as deciding by their character the merit of the work, and show the reason of my assertion, that I excel in all, but I presume it would be an unnecessary waste of attention. I would particularly show that Homer's object in his poem, viz. to reconcile the animosities and unite the councils of the Grecian states, by illustrating the evils which result from discord among chiefs, was unphilosophical and injurious; and that Virgil was hollow, hypocritical, and insincere in his pretended attempts to kindle the enthusiasm and cherish the national pride and patriotism of his countrymen, and that the rambling universal Cyclopædial subject of my poem is much better calculated than either of theirs to refine the manners, elevate the sentiments, and sublime the virtues of a country.

The AD in its present state is such as I shall probably leave it to its fate. Whether it be destined to survive its authour is a question that gives me no concern, as it can with truth be answered only in the affirmative. I would dedicate it to some great personage, but the impressive instances, which the history of poetry furnishes of the liability of poets to commit themselves in their dedications, restrain me. Those revolutions, which make it so convenient for a man to alter his notions, cannot be foreseen; and it is ever imprudent in these times of uncertainty and change, to pledge one's self in support of any principles, by uniting one's name with those who uphold them. These considerations have determined me to inscribe on this pillar of genius no name but my own, and content myself with the conscientious sincerity, with which I can exclaim,

Exegi Monumentum ære perennius.

ARGUMENT OF THE FIRST BOOK.

SUBJECT of the poem, and Invocation to Dictionary—Condition of Robinson Crusoe on the island of Juan Fernandes—His monologue on his disobedience to his parents, and the disasters which hence attended him—Appearance and speech of Pacificus, the guardian genius of the South Sea—They quit the hut of Robinson and ascend the hill at whose base it stands—The north corner of the island and a capacious frog-pond settling from their sight, and the Pacifick Ocean spreading far beneath their feet—The town of Cambridge draws into view, and is described by its hills, rivers, ponds, cornfields, ladies, colleges, stones, and pebbles.

The poem opens with unfolding the design of the authour, and with an invocation to DICTIONARY to furnish a copious supply of sesquipedalian words.

I sing the runaway, who first unfurl'd
A truant gib-sheet on the watery world;
And taught mankind what wreck-beladen raft
The placid wave to Juan's isle should waft.
Who eight and twenty years despotick swayed
A sceptre feared by none, by none obeyed;
Then left the paths his skin-clad steps had trod,
To cats run wild, and capricornal brood, &c.

* * * * * * * *

Almighty Dictionary, give my song
Thy column'd contents and thy lists so long.
'Tis thine to swell my line, direct my way,
Spread out each book, and fill my total lay.
Strong in thy strength, no suppliant knee I bend,
Invoke no aid, but that which thou canst lend.

The remembrance of the school boy difficulties, paternal chastisements, and pedagogical asperities, which swells the breast of Crusoe, is then expressed. Of his master he says,

.....of mighty statue, he
Rules o'er the truants with severest sway,
No threats affright him, and no tears allay.
He rears the rod, which blund'ring blockheads dread,
To birch the back, or maul the unmeaning head,
Twigs the sleek hair, the dirty palm he claps,
Ties the wild legs, or lawless knuckles raps, &c.

Parental punishments are enumerated and compared to civil corrections, as follows :

As when some leader of the mobile mob,
Too dull to counterfeit, afraid to rob,
But bent, by easier, safer, nobler skill,
To noy the nation and its virtue kill,
Roads his rude followers to some spacious plain,
Mounts the wide wash-tub, and harangues the train,
Tells them the laws for slaver souls are made, &c.

Then, if some constable but pass along,
Fled is the mob, and gone the threatening throng.
The rash ringleader, on the shoulder tipt,
Lops his long neck, and pines his pinions clipt.
Then on some dolorous day the ignoble post, &c.

This soliloquy is interrupted by the advent of Pacificus, guardian of the Pacifick Ocean. His approach is announced with due ceremony. To quote the passage would far exceed our limits. The following couplet we select—

Loose round his locks a sea-weed garland hung,
And liquid accents moved his piscate tongue.

He spoke and Crusoe raised his weary head,
His chair and table, chest and cottage fled,
Forth walked the pair where steep before them stood,
Slope from the hut a high hill crown'd with wood,
That, through disparting shades, arose on high,
Reached o'er the plain, and strutted up the sky;
Showed a clear summit fill'd with bird and beast,
Pigeons and goats, so savoury for a feast.
O'er the low lawn and creek it looks sublime,
Subjects the sea and levels many a clime.
The frog-pond's slimy waves from vision sink,
And frisk the frogs unseen about its brink.
The hut grows small and small, confused it swims,
And shrouds its figure, in the void it dims.

The guide then at length points out all the peculiarities of the various countries in sight. These as they have noth-

ing to do with the poem, and are put in, according to the modern school, merely by way of complement, we chiefly omit. Cambridge however is particularized as the seat of one of the great seminaries in the vast country,

Which banks and bounds the eastward rolling wave.

We will select some lines from the description.

See Charles's clear cold current course along,
Known to the muse, and sung in many a song.
Three wharves unload the breasting barks that ride,
O'er the salt surges of its tumbling tide.
A bridge, whose transverse planks its banks unite,
Piers the big beam, and blooms the red so bright.

Close by the passage of the turnpike road,
The Bath's rectangle rears him from the mud.
Mailed with pine beams his arms the waves oppose,
Prompt to attack, or to defend from foes.
But BATH ! what cakes of ice thy sides attack,
Tear every tenon, every cramp-iron crack.
ICE, cruel foe, with crystal arms prepared,
Down to the combat dreadful art thou car'd.
Seven beams last winter from the Bath were torn,
Bruised from the bank in aquean triumph borne.
The solid wave, in grand gyration whirl'd,
Shook the sound stick, and from its bottom twirl'd.
With flindering fury loved its end to rive,
Without one tear, to pity or relieve.

A description of the college buildings is next introduced.

.....Turn thy ken
To Massachusetts, Harvard, Hollis, Den,
Stoughton, and Holden, &c.

The notoriety of these edifices makes their delineation unnecessary, and we pass it over. Incidental to the notice of college, the ceremonies of commencement day are dwelt upon.

The genius of Cambridge common is enraged at the encroachments made on his territories by the erection of booths, &c. He calls for the assistance of RUM to aid in intoxicating the throngs, which crowd the common, and having expressed his determination of expelling

> The tented boothers from their canvass cots,

as soon as drunkenness shall have precluded resistance, reiterates his acclamations to the god Rum.

> Roused at the call, the monarch mounts the storm,
> In ether fumes he robes his spirite form.
> Breathes through the clouds that mist his shape, and throws
> A storm of vapour, piercing as he goes.
> The crowds grow addled, totter, sink, and fall,
> While maddening fumes the wondering sense appal.
> He comes careering from the tavern-bar,
> His customed colleagues crowd not round his car.
> Gin and hot toddy far behind him fly,
> Too weak to flow through this brain-firing sky.
> Earth reels and staggers while he rides amain,
> Tops the tall houses and usurps the plain.
> In triumph then his jolly jug he shows,
> Claws out the cork, and forth the liquor flows.
> With belting stream it winds the common round,
> Rolls the rough river, gullying deep the ground.
> Down in the dust the crowd their carcass fling,
> Grovel, and suck the multifluvial sling, &c.

The interposition of the constables however terminates the affair.

After other descriptions of academick celebranda, the poet thus eulogizes the ladies of Cambridge.

> The graces too, along thy classick plain,
> Robed in white garments, join the muse's train.
> Oh could I hope, with feeble pen, to draw
> Those charms, in Adela, which Oscar saw;
> Could my poor lines those sounds melodious show,
> Which Marion tuned to sooth her husband's woe;

Could I the art-formed landscape bring to view,
Which Rosa's soul conceived and pencil drew ;
Then I might dare with venturous pen to tell
On thy green banks, O Charles, what Beauties dwell.
Then I might say that where the creeping flower, &c.

(To be continued.)

LIMON.

".....Pratensibus optima.....
" Natura est." HOR.

IGNORANCE OF THE MONKS.

Dr. JORTIN relates a curious instance of the ignorance of the monks.

" After the Lutheran controversy had been long carried " on, many of the monks in Holland were so learned, that " they charged Luther with being the authour of a wicked " book, called the New Testament."—This reminds us of a story told in Boswell's Life of Johnson, of a Frenchman, who possessed considerable pretensions to literature, and had the reputation of being a man of very extensive knowledge. Conversing one day in London, in a circle of literary gentlemen, this foreigner observed, that there was in the Roman catholick service, a prayer, called *Pater Noster*, which he always thought a very beautiful piece of composition. I should like to know, he added, *who was the authour of it !*

CHARACTER OF SWIFT.

FEW learned men have been so unfortunate, upon the whole, in their biographers, as Swift. Not that there have been none to eulogize and defend him, but it has perversely

happened, that the accounts of his character, which tend to depreciate, have made up in popularity what they wanted in justice. Lord Orrery published a life of him, in which, though he called him *friend*, he seems from the quotations I have seen from it to have displayed strange and decided hostility. His book was written with anxious scrupulosity, and recommended by a highly figurative and ornamented style. From this noble authour the fame of Swift was defended by Dr. Delany, in a simple, unassuming narrative, tricked out with no rhetorical garnish, and enforced by no personal influence. Dr. Johnson, in his lives of the poets, has said some things of Swift, which candour and justice should have excluded. Sheridan, in an elaborate biography, extravagantly panegyrical, has attempted to refute every aspersion of his memory. From all that is to be collected from the authours enumerated, and upon maturely balancing their representations, it should seem that the character of Swift has been depreciated. For his unrivalled wit let his works speak: though it must be confessed that he did not follow in all cases the example of Hercules, who, when he was to remove the treasured filth of the Augean stables, made the purity of river water the instrument of his labours. For his moral character, I must think that he was, as Bolingbroke said, a hypocrite reversed; and that he on many occasions avoided the appearance of good, while he preserved the reality, with as much care as others would the appearance of evil. It is my opinion that we ought not to hesitate in saying that Swift was the greatest wit, and best man, in the two centuries, in part of which he lived.